<center>**REMARKS**</center>

[0001] Claims 1-19 are pending in the case. The Application stands subject to an election requirement based on a restriction requirement made under 35 USC §§121 and 372. Applicants are required to make an election between: Group I – Claims 1-5, 13, 18, and 19 and Group II – Claims 6-12, and 14-17. Applicant respectfully elects Group I – Claims 1-5, 13, 18, and 19 with traverse.

RESPONSE TO ELECTION REQUIREMENT

ELECTION OF A GROUP

[0002] Applicants elect the Group I – Claims 1-5, 13, 18, and 19 with traversal.

TRAVERSAL OF ELECTION REQUIREMENT

[0003] The Office Action asserts that Groups I and II are not related to a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature required under PCT Rule 13.2. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the common technical feature is the provisioning of associated portlets in a portal server. The Office Action further asserts that this feature is not a special technical feature.

[0004] Applicants agree that the provisioning of associated portlets in a portal server (Hereinafter "the technical feature") is a common technical feature of Group I and Group II. Applicants disagree that this technical feature is not a special technical feature. In contrast, and in accordance with the requirements of PCT Rule 13.2, Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is a special technical feature that defines "a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art." See PCT Rule 13.2.

[0005] In support of the position that the technical feature is a not a contribution which each of the claimed inventions makes as a whole over the prior art, the Office Action relies on US patent 6,985,939 (Hereinafter "Fletcher"). Applicants disagree with the characterization given to the Fletcher reference.

[0006] Fletcher teaches use of a portal platform and portlet model that serves as a proxy for web services. See Fletcher Abstract. Fletcher further describes a system interface for porlet management and a deployment interface for creating new web services. *Id.*

<center>3</center>

Fletcher also teaches the ability to aggregate web services together to form new webservices that leverage the functionality of the constituent web services. See Flecther Col. 5, ll. 23-36. These aggregated new services are formed from "fine-grained" services. See Fletcher Col. 6, l. 22. Fletcher further explains that binding a portlet to a portal in the prior art is not dynamic and in real-time as with the inventive aspects of Fletcher. See Fletcher Col. 5, ll. 41-47.

[0007] Applicants respectfully submit that the aggregation of webservices into new webservices, dynamic binding of webservices to portals, and generation of portlets that serve as webservice proxies as taught in Fletcher are fundamentally different from the collaboration groups that associate portlets in a portal server as recited in Claims 1-19, also known as the technical feature. The claimed invention is directed toward the technical feature and extends further to the concept that this association comprises forming of "collaboration groups of portlets having corresponding context names…" See Claim 1. The specification explains that this collaboration group "enables the collaboration among portlets within the same dynamic context portlet group to achieve business process and information integration and synchronization." See Specification Page. 6 line 11- page 7 line 2. Applicants respectfully submit that information integration and synchronization is not taught in Fletcher or the art of record. Therefore, because the technical feature includes synchronization between portlets in a portal, the technical feature is also a "special technical feature" within the requirements of PCT Rule 13.2 such that the restriction requirement is improper. Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn. However, if the Examiner does not agree, as noted above, Applicants elect Group I – Claims 1-5, 13, 18, and 19.

[0008] Applicants note that under PCT Rule 13.3 states: "The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim." Here Claims 1, 6, and 7 are linked because of the use of the language "collaboration groups" in reference to associated portlets. Claim 1 refers to "collaboration groups" explicitly where Claim 7 defines associated portlets to include "collaboration groups." In addition, Claim 12, 14, and 15 reference both collaboration groups (i.e. the technical feature) and the prioritization refresh features recited in Claim 6. Applicants submit that the feature of the "collaboration groups" and the refresh priorities provide at least two special technical features that justify withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

4

[0009] In the event any questions remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/David J. McKenzie/

David J. McKenzie
Reg. No. 46,919
Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 8, 2008
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929